

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 6-11, 13-22, 24-29, 39-45 and 73 are pending. A Final Office Action mailed March 6, 2008 objected to the drawings and Claims 25 and 26, and rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 and Claims 1, 4, 6-11, 13-22, 24-29, 39-45 and 73 under 35 U.S.C. § 103. By way of this amendment, Applicant hereby amends Claims 1, 16 and 39. Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.116, Applicant hereby respectfully requests reconsideration of the application.

OBJECTION TO THE DRAWINGS

The Final Office Action objected to the drawings because they did not show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant submits that in a preferred embodiment presents that the speaker 56 is a subwoofer speaker (FIGURE 1; page 7, lines 10 and 11; page 10, lines 17-24; page 12, lines 1-24). Therefore, Applicant submits that the term “a subwoofer speaker” is shown and described in the specification and drawings.

OBJECTION TO CLAIMS

The Final Office Action objected to Claims 25 and 26 for informalities. Applicant hereby amends Claims 25 and 26 thereby overcoming the noted informalities.

REJECTION OF CLAIM 1 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Final Office Action rejected Claim 1 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out distinctive claim subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant hereby amends Claim 1 in order to overcome the noted rejection. Therefore, Applicant submits that Claim 1 now particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.


25315

CUSTOMER NUMBER

- 8 -

VELO-1-1001RFOA

BLACK LOWE & GRAHAM ^{PLC}


701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4800
Seattle, Washington 98104
206.381.3300 • F: 206.381.3301

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Final Office Action rejected Claims 1, 4, 9-11, 13-18, 24-26 and 73 as being unpatentable over *Bull* in view of *Al-Ali et al* (hereinafter *Al-Ali*). The Final Office Action states that *Bull* discloses a subwoofer speaker housing that comprises at least one subwoofer speaker, a processor and a video output port. The Final Office Action states that *Al-Ali* teaches processing a second sound signal based on only the plurality of the adjustable subwoofer parameters and output the process second sound signal to the subwoofer speaker. The Final Office Action states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of *Al-Ali* into *Bull* to provide lower distortion in the low frequency, sub-base region. With regard to amended independent Claims 1, 16 and 39, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant submits that *Bull* discloses that a subwoofer speaker (34) is located in a subwoofer apparatus (box) (22) and that the subwoofer apparatus is located within a CPU box 12 (FIGURES 1-3; col. 3, lines 53-64; col. 4, lines 24-39). Thus, Applicant submits that *Bull* discloses that a subwoofer speaker is included in a subwoofer speaker housing which is then included in another computer box (CPU box 12). Applicant submits that *Bull* is related to speaker systems for use with computer systems and, more particularly, to a woofer/subwoofer speaker apparatus contained within a computer housing (col. 1, lines 6-14). This type of configuration leads to a woofer/subwoofer that is not optimum because the CPU box will adversely affect the sound produced by the enclosed speaker. *Bull* includes the subwoofer speaker and subwoofer speaker housing in the CPU box in order to save space in and around the computer system (col. 1, lines 6-14). *Al-Ali* discloses a sound system 20 that has a loudspeaker 22 in a housing 23 (FIGURE 1; col. 3, lines 28-60). The controller 54 is not included in the housing 23.

Therefore, Applicant submits that *Bull* and *Al-Ali*, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest that the subwoofer speaker is only included in the speaker housing and that the speaker housing also includes a processor and a video output port. Therefore, Applicant submits that amended independent Claims 1 and 16 are allowable over the cited references.

Because Claims 4, 9-11, 13-15, 17, 18, 24-26 and 73 depend from allowable independent claims, they are allowable for the same reasons that make their corresponding independent claims allowable.

The Final Office Action rejected Claims 6-8 and 27-29 as being unpatentable over *Bull* and *Al-Ali* in view of *Ouchi*. Applicant submits that *Ouchi* fails to overcome deficiencies noted above with regard to *Bull*. Therefore, because Claims 6-8 and 27-29 depend from allowable independent claims, they are allowable for the same reasons that make their corresponding independent claims allowable.

The Final Office Action rejected Claims 19-22 as being unpatentable over *Bull* and *Al-Ali* in view of *Emoto*. Applicant submits that *Emoto* fails to overcome the deficiencies noted above with regard to *Bull*. Therefore, because Claims 19-22 depend from allowable independent claims, they are allowable for the same reasons that make their corresponding independent claims allowable.

The Final Office Action rejected Claims 39-45 as being unpatentable over *Emoto* in view of *Al-Ali*. The Final Office Action states that *Emoto* does not explicitly teach a subwoofer speaker unit and processing the first sound signal based on only a plurality of adjustable subwoofer parameters. However, *Al-Ali* teaches a subwoofer speaker unit and processing the first sound signal based on only a plurality of adjustable subwoofer parameters. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant submits that *Emoto* and *Al-Ali*, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest that the subwoofer speaker is only included in the subwoofer speaker unit and that a processor is also included in the subwoofer speaker unit. Therefore, Applicant submits that amended

independent Claim 39 is allowable over the cited references. Because Claims 40-45 depend from allowable independent Claim 39, they are allowable for the same reasons that make their corresponding independent claim allowable.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW WITH EXAMINER

On June 2, the examiner (Mr. Lun-See Lao) and Applicant's representative (Mr. Michael Smith) discussed this amendment to the independent claims. The examiner believed them to be different than Bull, but would require new consideration and/or search.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that the Claims of the pending application are now in condition for allowance over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections, allowance, and early passage through issuance. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's agent listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

BLACK LOWE & GRAHAM^{PLLC}


Michael S. Smith
Registration No. 39,563
Dial: 206.749.9888